

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the allowance of claims 1-5, 13-17, 22, and 23. Reconsideration of the Objections and Rejections of the Office Action and allowance of the remaining claims are respectfully requested in view of Applicant's remarks below.

Interview Summary

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy of an interview on August 19, 2011. During the interview, Applicants proposed claim set in regards to the outstanding claim objections and rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 were discussed. An agreement was reached. Applicants are in agreement with the Examiner's August 23, 2011 interview summary.

Remarks Regarding Amendments to the Specification

Applicants have amended the specification to capitalize and label trademarks where they appear. Applicant has also amended the specification to correct typos in the spelling of AEROSIL and in thixotropic in the table that appears on page 14 of the filed application.

Remarks Regarding Claim Amendments

The amendments to the claims are supported throughout the application as filed, including the specification and original claims. Entry of the claim amendments is requested.

Remarks Regarding Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants note with appreciation that the Examiner has indicated that claims 1-5, 13-17, 22 and 23 are deemed allowable over the prior art of record.

Further Applicants note that the Examiner has indicated that claims 21 and 24-26 are indicated as allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections. As discussed in detail below, Applicants have amended the claims according to the Examiner's suggestions in the Office Action and during the Interview.

Allowance of the claims is respectfully requested in view of the Amendments and comments in this paper.

Remarks Regarding Claim Objections

Claims 1, 2, 16, and 26 were objected to as allegedly informal. Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, and 16 to replace "polyalkyleneoxide modified polydimethylsiloxane and ethyl acrylate-2-ethylhexyl acrylate copolymer" with "a polyalkyleneoxide-modified polydimethylsiloxane and an ethyl acrylate-2-ethylhexyl acrylate copolymer" as suggested by the Examiner.

In claim 16, Applicants have inserted a comma between "comprising" and "relative" as suggested by the Examiner.

In claim 26, Applicants have amended "styrene/butadiene styrene block copolymer" to "styrene/butadiene/styrene block copolymer" as suggested by the Examiner. Applicants have also replaced "silicon containing" with "silicon-containing" as suggested by the examiner.

Withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

Remarks Regarding Section 112 Rejections

Claims 25 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph as allegedly not reasonably providing enablement for specific compound derivatives and a plurality of silicon containing oligomers. Applicants traverse.

In response to the Examiner's rejections, Applicants have amended Claim 25 to no longer specifically recite derivatives of thioxanethone, anthraquinone, anthracene, and perylene. In response to Examiner's rejections, Applicants have amended Claim 26 to recite "a silicon-containing oligomer" rather than "silicon containing oligomers." Support for these amendments can be found in paragraph [0045] and [0046] of the application as filed. For these reasons, withdrawal of Section 112 first paragraph rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 21 and 24-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph as allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants traverse.

Claim 21 was rejected as using improper Markush terminology. In response to the Examiner's rejection, Applicants have amended claim 21 to insert "of" between consisting and bisphenol A diglycidyl ether as the Examiner suggested. Withdrawal of the rejection in section 6A of the Office Action is thus respectfully requested.

Claim 24 has been amended to eliminate the recitation of the plural form for the specifically claimed components in order to address the Examiner's rejection and to more clearly define the invention. Furthermore, component "L" has been deleted in response to the Examiner's rejection. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection in section 6B of the Office Action is respectfully requested.

Claim 25 has been amended to no longer specifically recite derivatives of thioxanethone, anthraquinone, anthracene, and perylene. Since the amendment renders the rejection moot, withdrawal of the rejection in section 6C of the Office Action is respectfully requested.

Claim 26 has been amended to recite "a silicon-containing oligomer" instead of "silicon containing oligomers" in response to the Examiner's rejection. Therefore, withdrawal of rejection 6D is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Having fully responded to the pending Office Action, Applicants submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and earnestly solicit an early Notice to that effect. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned if additional information is required.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: /Eric Sinn/
Eric Sinn

901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100